

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 22, 25, 26, and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee; claims 23, 24, 27, and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee as evidenced by Kwag and Kogure; claims 22-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kwag as evidenced by Lee and Kogure.

Claims 22 and 26 were amended to include the limitations of consisting essentially of forming a solution by combining HF with a concentration of 49% with H₂O₂ with a concentration of 29%-30% in deionized water wherein said forming a solution further comprises using a volume ratio greater than 1:1:20 of HF:H₂O₂:deionized water. The claimed limitations differ from the prior art in that the volume ratio of greater than 1:1:20 of HF:H₂O₂:deionized water is not disclosed in any of the cited prior art references. In forming the rejection the examiner states that one of ordinary skill in the art could arrive at the claimed invention through routine experimentation. This is not the case for the claimed limitations of claims 22 and 26. There is nothing in the cited references that would lead one of ordinary skill in the art to the claimed vol. ratios. There are an infinite number of possibilities for the volume ratios and the claimed limitation is therefore not obtainable using routine experimentation. Claims 22 and 26 are therefore allowable over the cited art. Claims 25 and 29 depend on claim 22 and 26 respectively and therefore contain all the limitations of claims 22 and 26. Claims 25 and 29 are therefore also allowable over the cited art.

Claims 24 and 28 were amended to include the limitations of consisting essentially of forming a solution by combining HF with a concentration of 49% with H₂O₂ with a concentration of 29%-30% in deionized water wherein said forming a solution further comprises using a volume ratio greater than 2:1:21 of HF:H₂O₂:deionized water. The claimed limitations differ from the prior art in that the volume ratio of greater than 2:1:21 of HF:H₂O₂:deionized water is not disclosed in any of the cited prior art references. In forming the rejection the examiner states that one of ordinary skill in the


art could arrive at the claimed invention through routine experimentation. This is not the case for the claimed limitations of claims 24 and 28. There is nothing in the cited references that would lead one of ordinary skill in the art to the claimed vol. ratios. There are an infinite number of possibilities for the volume ratios and the claimed limitation is therefore not obtainable using routine experimentation. Claims 24 and 28 are therefore allowable over the cited art. Claims 30 and 31 depend on claim 24 and 28 respectively and therefore contain all the limitations of claims 24 and 28. Claims 30 and 31 are therefore also allowable over the cited art.

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

While it is believed that the instant response places the application in condition for allowance, should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned in order to expeditiously resolve any outstanding issues.

To the extent necessary, Applicant petitions for an Extension of Time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any fees in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to the deposit account of Texas Instruments Incorporated, Account No. 20-0668.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Peter K. McLarty', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Peter K. McLarty
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 44,923

Texas Instruments Incorporated
P.O. Box 655474, MS 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
(972) 917-4258